



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

men, etc. (p. 90); credit does not increase facilities of exchange in proportion to the work to be done since 1873 (p. 93); the annual product of gold has not increased (*ibid.*), when it is now the greatest in history; paper money in the United States is not kept equal to gold by redemption, but by the fact that their *utilities* are equal (p. 127); national banks make a profit by issue of notes, rather than by discounts (p. 129).

J. LAURENCE LAUGHLIN.

Socialism. By ROBERT FLINT. London: Isbister & Co.; Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co., 1895. 8vo. pp. 512.

THE first eight chapters (298 pages out of 498) of this volume are, for the greater part, rewritten from lectures delivered "before an audience chiefly of workingmen," and afterward published as a series of papers in *Good Words*. Still it is a work which aspires to some scientific standing, as will appear from a glance at its table of contents. There are chapters on the History of Socialism, Socialism and Labor, Socialism and Capital, the Nationalization of Land, the Collectivisation of Capital, Socialism and Social Organization. The two hundred pages not based on the author's lectures are still more significant of a serious purpose; they deal with the questions of Socialism and Democracy, Socialism and Morality, Socialism and Religion.

Professor Flint sets out with many citations of definitions of his subject from various writers and then gives his own definition (p. 17), which reads: "Socialism is any theory of social organization which sacrifices the legitimate liberties of individuals to the will or interests of the community." He goes on to say (pp. 17-18): "I do not think we can get much farther in the way of definition. The thing to be defined is of its very nature vague, and to present what is vague as definite is to misrepresent it. No definition of Socialism at once true and precise has ever been given or ever will be given. For Socialism is essentially indefinite, indeterminable. It is a tendency and movement towards an extreme. . . . Socialism is the exaggeration of the rights and claims of society, just as Individualism is the exaggeration of the rights and claims of individuals. The latter system rests on excessive or exclusive faith in individual independence; the former system rests on excessive or exclusive faith in social authority." This is, of course, a definition which involves a condemnation of that which it sets out to characterize, and is therefore an unfortunate defini-

tion for any useful purpose. It is, moreover, an attempt at defining socialism in the extreme generical sense so as to include all possible phases and manifestations of the movement in the past and the present, and not specifically that definitely conceived movement which confronts society with such singleness of purpose today, and which is the object of so much lively alarm and of so much hope and enthusiasm. This chapter on the definition of socialism has, indeed, more to do with fossil and recent forms than with that extant type of socialism which one might fairly expect would be treated of by a teacher who is addressing a popular audience with the avowed purpose of instructing and influencing them in their attitude toward the movement as one of the vital questions of the day. It also appears in a later chapter (p. 61) that "The kind of Socialism most in repute at present . . . is the government of all by and for all, with private property largely or wholly abolished, capital rendered collective, industrial armies formed under the control of the state on co-operative principles, and work assigned to every individual and its value determined for him." "The Socialism thus described has come to be commonly designated Collectivism, and the name is convenient and appropriate. It is the only kind of Socialism greatly in repute at present, or really formidable; and, consequently, it is the form of it which especially requires to be examined. It is the Socialism which I shall henceforth have chiefly in view" (pp. 62-63). The prefacing of his discussion by the characterization first cited above becomes all the more surprising when it appears that the author finds this second and very different definition necessary for practical use.

It may be noted in connection with this painstaking effort at defining his subject that while Professor Flint quotes with approval and in support of his own position Shaeffle's characterization of socialism (pp. 61-62) he falls foul of the same authority in a curious manner at an earlier point (p. 18). Professor Flint formulates in strong terms the view that socialism is, in point of principle, the diametrical opposite of individualism; whereas Schaeffle in his well-known *Impossibility of Social Democracy* has this to say in amplification of his definition of collectivism: "Liberalism and socialism are offspring of the same spirit, the spirit of Individualism." "It [Collectivism] is at bottom . . . the extreme of Individualism—Individualism in universal realization, and intensified by the envious fancy of the proletariat." The impression produced by this lack of harmony between the author and

the authority whom he cites in support of his own position is heightened by certain passages in a later chapter (pp. 97-100) where he professes the view that socialism and individualism are in a vital sense coincident in point of fundamental principle.

The manner in which the author's position vacillates between an identification of socialism with individualism and a contrasting of the two as antagonistic opposites suggests the generalization (which might perhaps not be borne out by a careful re-reading of the volume) that the two are held to be antagonistic in those portions of the book which are printed in large type, and to be identical in those portions which are in small print. The large print contains (apparently) the substance of the popular lectures which formed the nucleus of the book ; the fine print, the most of the subsequent emendations.

It may be in place to say a word in extenuation of the lexicographer Littré's fault, when he is criticised by Professor Flint (p. 15) for his definition of socialism, which "is, if possible, worse" than that given by the dictionary of the Academy. The Academy dictionary's definition reads ; "The doctrine of men who pretend to change the state, and to reform it, on an altogether new plan ;" Littré's definition as quoted by Professor Flint is ; "A system which, regarding political reforms as of subordinate importance, offers a plan of social reform." Now, while Professor Flint may be well within the bounds in saying that it is by no means characteristic of the socialism of today "to subordinate the political to the social," Littré was perhaps equally accurate in his day in defining it as he did. Littré's socialistic (communistic) bias was acquired early. It dates back to the period when the term "socialism" first came into vogue. The definition which he gives is probably to be taken as answering to his own first-hand knowledge of the use of the term at that early day, and it defines the usage of that time with Littré's accustomed discrimination. The term took its early meaning from Owenism, and even appreciably later than the middle of the century "socialism" denoted, in European usage, a relatively respectable upper-class movement for the amelioration of the lot of humanity in general, and of the working class in particular, by social rather than political reform. The movement inaugurated by Marx and Engels in the forties is the typical "socialist" movement of today ; but when these men drew up the *Manifesto of the Communist Party* in 1847 they, and the League whose spokesmen they were, unhesitatingly adopted the term "communism" to describe their movement.

Marx and Engels, in the turbulent years of the forties, could no more have classed their propaganda as "socialism" than Mr. Hyndman or Mr. Morris today could class their activity under the head of "university settlements."

The discussion under the head of Socialism and Labor does not inspire confidence in Professor Flint's apprehension of what is involved in the socialist doctrine of labor-value and of the "Right to the Entire Product of Labor." There occurs, *e. g.*, the following passage (p. 126): "Karl Marx . . . maintains that *the value of work should be estimated according to the quantity of socially necessary labor expended, or, in equivalent terms, according to the time which must be on the average occupied in the work.* There is neither reasonableness nor justice in this view. Mere expenditure of labor does not produce any value, and is not entitled to any remuneration. A man may labor long and hard in producing something in which nobody can see any use or beauty. If he do so, he will get nothing for his labor, and he has no right to expect anything for it. He may expend ten hours' labor in producing what there is so little demand for that he will get merely the pay of one hour's work for it." To this it is to be said that probably no socialist would have any hesitation in repudiating the construction of the doctrine of labor-value contained in this comment. That doctrine is surely infirm enough to inspire surprise at its wide acceptance, but its weakness is not so obvious at the first glance as the construction put upon it by Professor Flint (pp. 126-127) would imply. Marx was too skillful a dialectician (to say nothing more) to base his economic scheme on so undisguised an absurdity. Still, the discussion of the Marxian theory of value and surplus-value is suggestive, though it is scarcely as conclusive as Professor Flint appears to find it.

In the chapter on Socialism and Labor (pp. 149-150, there is a fairly lucid statement of the Marxian (socialistic) definition of "capital." Capital, according to this view, comprises those productive goods which are held as private property and employed by means of hired labor for the production of a profit. In the chapter on Socialism and Capital (pp. 157 *et seq.*), however, when speaking of the ungrounded hostility of socialists to "capital" this peculiar socialistic concept of capital as "an historical category" is forgotten, and the discussion plainly proceeds on the assumption that socialistic hostility to "capital" means hostility to the instruments of production. This failure

to consistently maintain the distinction between the socialist concept of capital and the concept as currently in vogue vitiates the entire chapter.

Occasionally there crop out curiosities of economic argument ; the following (pp. 216-217) is an example taken from the chapter on the Nationalization of Land (a portion of the argument which has apparently been carried over with but inconsiderable change from the popular lecture): "The rise and fall of the rents of land, then, depend on the labor and good or bad fortune of society no otherwise than the rise and fall of all other rents, of all prices, and of all values. There is nothing special or peculiar in the mode of their increase or in the course of their movement which can warrant society to treat them in an exceptional way, and to deal with property in land differently from all other property. . . . The man who can believe that land is in this country the exclusively, or even a specially, remunerative kind of property, that the want of it is a necessary and chief cause of poverty, and the possession of it the infallible and abundant source of wealth, displays a remarkable power of adhering to a prepossession in defiance of its contradiction by experience. Is there any kind of property which increases less in value in Britain than land? It is known not to have doubled in value during the last seventy years. It has certainly diminished in value during the last twenty years." It would perhaps be impossible to pursue a line of argument less convincing than this to the advocate of land nationalization on the ground of the doctrine of an unearned increment, or one that would be more completely beside the point.

The discussion is abreast of the time with respect to the position taken on State Socialism and Christian Socialism, both of which movements are excluded by Professor Flint from the category of modern socialism proper. With regard to the latter of the two there occurs (pp. 440-441) the following summary statement: "Christianity and Socialism, then, are not so related as those who are styled Christian Socialists imagine. What is called Christian Socialism will always be found to be either unchristian in so far as it is socialistic, or unsocialistic in so far as it is truly and fully Christian."

The range of the discussion is such as to preclude any detailed review of the contents of the volume. The book bears testimony to its author's erudition at the same time that it shows a wide acquaintance with writers and events related to the socialist movement. The

method of treatment varies from the homiletical to the polemical, and is generally *ex parte*, in spite of an evident effort at impartial presentation. The presence of an animus throughout the argument results in such narrowness of construction as defeats the main purpose of the book. One feels in reading the triumphant refutation of one after another of the socialist positions that the positions in question have not been stated in their strongest and most reasonable form, and that the discussion for that reason does not dispose of the questions with any finality. Its refutations (and it is eminently a volume of refutations) will be accepted as conclusive chiefly by those who are already in a frame of mind to accept the conclusions offered. It can scarcely be said to be a book with which science, especially the science of economics, will have to count. There is a lack of unity, not to say of consistency, in the treatment of the subject and in the point of view from which it is approached, and even in the salient features of the characterization of the movement itself. It is a book that might have been more useful, and probably would have met with a more sympathetic acceptance at the hands of intelligent people, a generation ago than today.

T. B. VEBLEN.

Social England. A Record of the Progress of the People in Religion, Laws, Arts, Industry, Commerce, Science, Literature and Manners, from the Earliest Times to the Present Day. By Various Writers. Edited by H. D. TRAILL, D.C.L. Volume I., From the Earliest Times to the Accession of Edward I.; Volume II., From the Accession of Edward I. to the Death of Henry VII. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1893-1894, 8vo. pp. lvi+504 and xii+587.

THE first two volumes of this ambitious work may not be fully representative of the whole, but they at least enable one to judge the merits of this unique plan. The scope of the five volumes which are promised is indicated by the sub-title, as also by the following passage from the introduction. "A civilized nation may be treated as a Society, a Polity or a State among States. . . . It has been the object aimed at in these pages to *abstract* from the political, and to *isolate* the social facts of our history wherever this can be done." To accomplish this the material has been grouped under seven heads, as follows: Civil Organization, Religion, Learning and Science, Literature, Art,